

**Missouri State Museum, Connecting to Collection Statewide Planning Grant
Final Performance Report, Pt. 1: Narrative, 6/1/2010 – 5/31/2012**

Project Title: “Partnership for Missouri Heritage”

Partners

Missouri State Museum, Missouri State Archives, Missouri State Library, The State Historical Society of Missouri, Western Historical Manuscript Collection (merged with State Historical Society of Missouri in 2011), Missouri Historical Records Advisory Board, Missouri History Museum, Missouri Association for Museums and Archives (formerly Missouri Museums Association)

Project Overview (Goal, Design, Achievements)

The project goal was to create an infrastructure for identification and assessment of collection care at Missouri cultural heritage institutions. The project design was to accomplish this through a series of activities: statewide collections survey, basic preservation workshops, online database of Missouri institutions, information dissemination and an action plan.

Despite staff layoffs and losses at multiple partner institutions (which caused an extension of the grant to a second year), the project had several accomplishments. The formed advisory group enabled better communication, information sharing and coordination (which continue post-project). A statewide survey of collecting institutions was accomplished. An online directory/database was set up and work continues on obtaining survey information from additional institutions. Basic preservation workshops were held across the state with 82 participants. From the survey and the workshops, information was gathered to create the action plan included here, with a priority list of next steps.

Project Activities

1. **Advisory Group:**

The Advisory Group consisted of Linda Endersby (Director, Missouri State Museum), Shelly Croteau (Asst. State Archivist, Missouri State Archives), Laura Wilson (State Historical Society

of Missouri), Alana Inman (Principal Assistant, Missouri Historical Records Advisory Board), Margaret Conroy (State Librarian, Missouri State Library), Chris Gordon (Missouri History Museum), Greg Olson (Board Member, Missouri Association for Museums and Archives), and David Moore (Western Historical Manuscript Collection) (discontinued service in group after merger of this institution with the State Historical Society of Missouri).

Over the course of the project, the advisory group met six times. Subcommittees on the survey development, the online database/directory, the workshops and the action plan met more frequently during the appropriate periods.

2. Survey

The survey was developed by a subcommittee from the partnership and staff from the Institute for Public Policy at the University of Missouri (MUIPP). MUIPP conducted the survey from September – December 2010. A total of 180 surveys were completed from 495 institutions contacted. (An additional 25 surveys were completed during the workshop process.)

3. Online Database/Directory

An online directory is available of Missouri heritage collecting institutions. General information on the institution (name, address, type, contact information) is available to the public. Results from the survey questions are available to organizations represented on the advisory board. Work continues to get additional institutions to complete the survey questions and have the data entered.

4. Workshops:

Five workshops were held throughout the state: Springfield (southwest), Columbia (central), St. Charles (east/northeast), St. Joseph (west/northwest), and Cape Girardeau (southeast). A total of 82 people participated. Each participant received the following “take-aways”: resources binder, Museum Materials sample book, and two reference books (*Registration Methods for Small Museums* and *Indian Artifacts*). Linda Endersby (Director, Missouri State Museum) and Linda Landry (Conservator, Missouri History Museum) conducted the workshops.

5. Action Plan:

An Action Plan was written, with a list of priorities and next steps to be taken toward the goals of the Connecting to Collections initiative. Three of the original partners have committed to follow-up on steps outlined in the plan (Missouri State Museum, Missouri State Archives, Missouri Association for Museums and Archives).

6. Information Dissemination:

In Missouri, particularly among small institutions, the best dissemination is by word-of-mouth. This was accomplished mainly through the hands-on workshops across the state. One page information handouts regarding museums in Missouri and the economic impact of museum's nationwide were created and distributed electronically.

Project Audience

The target audience for the project was staff (paid and unpaid) at Missouri institutions holding heritage collections. In particular, the project targeted staff at small- to mid-size museums.

Project Analysis

The project successfully created an infrastructure for identification and assessment of collection care at Missouri cultural heritage institutions. The advisory group meetings radically increased communication and coordination of efforts, which continues post-project. Previous to the project, communication on outreach efforts by the larger institutions to the smaller institutions was intermittent and uncoordinated.

Information on heritage collections in Missouri's institutions more than tripled through the project's survey. While on 65 institutions responded to the Heritage Health Index survey, almost 200 institutions responded to the Partnership for Missouri Heritage survey. However, it is estimated that Missouri has close to 500 institutions with heritage collections. The action plan outlines steps that will be taken to continue to gather information on the remaining institutions.

The creation of the survey and the online directory/database has provided an infrastructure to continue that process.

The audience for project activities met the target audience well. Of those institution's reached, 76% of institutions only volunteer staff or no full-time paid staff. In addition, 68% of institutions reached had annual budgets under \$150,000.

The project met multiple unanticipated events that created delays. The Missouri State Museum, the grant coordinator, underwent substantial staff changes. This included the resignation of the Director, followed by the Assistant Director (grant coordinator) serving also as Acting Director during the grant period. In addition, one of the partner institutions merged into another of the partner institutions, caused multiple staff layoffs. There were also staff changes at two other partner institutions.

Despite the staffing issues, the project, with an extended deadline, continued and got back on track in its second year. The planned activities of the grant were completed successfully.

The workshops in particular provided an opportunity to communicate with staff from a variety of institutions and at a variety of experience levels. The response to the workshops as shown through evaluations was extremely positive (evaluation form included in attachments). The evaluation rated workshop content, organization, and instructor knowledge on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being high and 1 being low. These were rated at 4.4, 4.8, and 4.1 respectively – with no marks below 3. When asked what was the most useful among the course materials, respondents were very positive among the “take-homes” that were provided through the grant – the museum materials sampler book, the Heritage Preservation Salvage and Response Wheel and two reference books (*Registration Methods for Small Museums* and *Native American Objects*). One respondent commented that they “loved being able to touch and see the materials and supply's . . . the books will make a great addition to my go-to library. One of my favorites though is the Emergency response and salvage wheel. So nice to have something that's easy to use!!!” Another commented that “All material covered was very beneficial. There were new ideas and perspectives that were great!”

When respondents to the evaluation were asked what were the least useful of the course materials, multiple workshop participants responded along the lines that “all were useful” or “thought they were all good” and “I thought everything had its place.”

Another, less formal evaluation of the workshops came from the staff at one of the multiple state-run historic sites. One interpreter and one volunteer had attended the Columbia workshop and were so excited by what they had learned. They informed their district supervisor, who in turn talked to district supervisors in geographic areas where the workshops had not yet been conducted. Staff from five state-run historic sites attended a later workshop in Cape Girardeau – based on the recommendation.

Prior to this project, there was no organized, statewide network to coordinate or provide information to heritage institutions in the state of Missouri. Thus, efforts, except at an institutional level, towards improving the conditions and knowledge of heritage collections were hampered. This project was a major move forward toward preserving heritage collections across the state. While the response to the survey did not meet the original goal, it could be considered good in comparison to other states. One of the lessons learned was that we set that goal too high – at least for the initial survey.

This project also confirmed something that museum professionals in the state had learned anecdotally: participation for many institutions (particularly those that were small and volunteer-run) was substantially higher if there was personal contact involved, such as phone calls and visits or word-of-mouth.

What's Next?

The Partnership for Missouri Heritage will continue, under joint sponsorship of the Missouri State Museum and the Missouri Association for Museums and Archives, with the Missouri State Archives as a major contributing partner. These three entities will apply for funding to continue and expand activities.

Until grant funding comes through (and if no grant funding comes through), the Missouri State Museum has committed time from curatorial assistants and/or interns to continuing the work to gather survey information from additional institutions. In June and July 2012 (post-project), a State Park Youth Corps worker gave time to this project.

The Missouri Association for Museums and Archives will be offering workshops during the fall of 2012 and spring of 2013 in response to needs gathered from participants in this project's workshops. Another workshop on Collections Scope/Deaccessioning/Documentation is under development. The Basics of Historic Object Preservation workshop curriculum will be used to conduct a workshop in north central Missouri in the Fall 2012.

These activities already in progress after the end of the grant period on May 31, 2012, show the commitment on the part of the Missouri State Museum and the Missouri Association for Museums and Archives to sustain the momentum gained by the Connecting to Collections Statewide Planning Grant.

Grant Products

1. Museum Materials Sampler book
2. Resources binder
3. One-page information sheet/general economic impact
4. Online Directory
5. Action plan

Institution Name: Missouri State Museum

Grant #: LG - 4 1 - 1 0 - 0 0 1 9 - 1 0

A. SITE SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTIVITY: Workshops

1. _____ Total # of collection items conserved, relocated to protective storage, rehoused, or for which other preservation-appropriate physical action was taken.

2. _____ Total # of collection items digitized, scanned, reformatted, or for which other electronic or digital preservation action was taken.

3. _____ Total # of collection items with new or enhanced accessibility (include items that were cataloged or for which finding aids or other records were created or computerized) [includes _____ items made accessible to users other than grantee staff for the first time, _____ items with new or enhanced access for staff only].

4. _____ Total # of lectures, symposia, demonstrations, exhibits, readings, performances, concerts, broadcasts, Webcasts, workshops, multi-media packages, or other learning opportunities provided for the public (do not include PSAs or other promotional activities) [includes _____ out-of-school or after-school programs, _____ exhibits].

5. _____ Total # of tools created, improved, or produced for searching, information management, or information analysis by users other than or in addition to grantee staff.

6. 5 Total # of conferences, programs, workshops, training sessions, institutes, classes, courses, or other structured educational events provided.

7. _____ Total # of internships, apprenticeships, mentoring opportunities, or other extended educational opportunities provided.

8. _____ Total # of degrees/certificates earned as a result of the grant [includes _____ Master's, _____ Ph.D. degrees, _____ other (specify): _____].

9. _____ Total # technology upgrades or improvements (specify): _____.

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.
See attached.

B. PORTABLE PRODUCTS (relating to the activity named in section A.)

11. 2 Total # of research reports, papers, books, reprints, or other publications generated.

12. 1 Total # of Web sites developed or improved [include URLs/addresses:
<http://missourimuseums.org/partnership-for-missouri-heritage>].

13. 1 Total # of learning resources produced [includes _____ oral histories, _____ curriculum resources, _____ curriculums, _____ Web-based learning tools, or X other (specify): Museum Materials Sample book].

14. _____ Total # of key management documents created [includes _____ emergency plans, _____ conservation surveys, _____ strategic plans, 1 other (specify): Action plan].

15. If your grant created one or more quantifiable products not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

C. PARTICIPANTS/VISITORS/USERS/AUDIENCE (relating to the activity named in section A.)

16. _____ Total # of **community organization partners** [includes _____ informal partners, _____ formal partners].

17. _____ Total # of **schools** (pre-K through grade 12) that used services provided by your grant (include only schools that actively participated, not those to which material was simply distributed or made available) [includes _____ students participating in field trips].

18. _____ Total # of **teachers** supported, trained, or otherwise provided with resources to strengthen classroom teaching or learning.

19. _____ Total # of **pre-K through grade-12 students** served [includes _____ youth 9-19 who used, participated, visited, or otherwise interacted with activities, experiences, resources, or products offered by your grant].

20. _____ Total # of **viewers and listeners** for radio, television, and cable broadcasts (for series, include total actual audience for all broadcasts; do not include audience for PSAs or other promotional activities or Webcasts; do not report potential audience).

21. _____ Total # of **users of Web-based resources** provided by your grant (include all individuals the project served). Choose the measure that best represents your use rate (choose only one): _____ visits (hits), _____ unique visitors, _____ registered users, _____ other measure (specify): _____.

22. 289 Total # of **individuals** benefiting from your grant (include all those from questions 18-21 plus others the project served, including staff or others in your field). Only include those who actually participated or used your project services in some way.

23. This number includes: 40 **professionals**, 17 **non-professionals or pre-professionals**, _____ **docents or interpreters**, 9 **volunteers**,
15 **staff** that received services provided by your grant.

24. If your grant served one or more quantifiable audiences not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

Directions for submitting this report are available at <http://www.imls.gov/recipients/administration.shtm>. For assistance or questions contact your Program Officer.

Burden Estimate and Request for Public Comments: Public reporting burden for this collection of information (Final Report, Parts 1 and 2) is estimated to average eight to thirteen hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Chief Information Officer, 1800 M Street, NW, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20036-5802, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 3137-0029, Washington, DC 20503.

**Missouri State Museum, Connecting to Collection Statewide Planning Grant
Final Performance Report, Pt. 2: Quantitative Information**

Attachment for Following Questions:

Site Specific Project Activity: Planning, Survey and Workshops

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here.

In addition to the workshops, the grant activities also included the formation of an advisory group, a survey of heritage collecting institutions, and the creation of an online directory of these institutions.

199 institutions responded to the survey (495 institutions received the survey)

10 professionals participated in multiple meetings of the advisory group

450 institutions were entered into the online directory/database

Institution Name: Missouri State Museum

Grant #: LG - 4 1 - 1 0 - 0 0 1 9 - 1 0

A. SITE SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTIVITY: Workshops

1. _____ Total # of collection items conserved, relocated to protective storage, rehoused, or for which other preservation-appropriate physical action was taken.

2. _____ Total # of collection items digitized, scanned, reformatted, or for which other electronic or digital preservation action was taken.

3. _____ Total # of collection items with new or enhanced accessibility (include items that were cataloged or for which finding aids or other records were created or computerized) [includes _____ items made accessible to users other than grantee staff for the first time, _____ items with new or enhanced access for staff only].

4. _____ Total # of lectures, symposia, demonstrations, exhibits, readings, performances, concerts, broadcasts, Webcasts, workshops, multi-media packages, or other learning opportunities provided for the public (do not include PSAs or other promotional activities) [includes _____ out-of-school or after-school programs, _____ exhibits].

5. _____ Total # of tools created, improved, or produced for searching, information management, or information analysis by users other than or in addition to grantee staff.

6. 5 Total # of conferences, programs, workshops, training sessions, institutes, classes, courses, or other structured educational events provided.

7. _____ Total # of internships, apprenticeships, mentoring opportunities, or other extended educational opportunities provided.

8. _____ Total # of degrees/certificates earned as a result of the grant [includes _____ Master's, _____ Ph.D. degrees, _____ other (specify): _____].

9. _____ Total # technology upgrades or improvements (specify): _____.

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.
See attached.

B. PORTABLE PRODUCTS (relating to the activity named in section A.)

11. 2 Total # of research reports, papers, books, reprints, or other publications generated.

12. 1 Total # of Web sites developed or improved [include URLs/addresses:
<http://missourimuseums.org/partnership-for-missouri-heritage>].

13. 1 Total # of learning resources produced [includes _____ oral histories, _____ curriculum resources, _____ curriculums, _____ Web-based learning tools, or X other (specify): Museum Materials Sample book].

14. _____ Total # of key management documents created [includes _____ emergency plans, _____ conservation surveys, _____ strategic plans, 1 other (specify): Action plan].

15. If your grant created one or more quantifiable products not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

C. PARTICIPANTS/VISITORS/USERS/AUDIENCE (relating to the activity named in section A.)

16. _____ Total # of **community organization partners** [includes _____ informal partners, _____ formal partners].

17. _____ Total # of **schools** (pre-K through grade 12) that used services provided by your grant (include only schools that actively participated, not those to which material was simply distributed or made available) [includes _____ students participating in field trips].

18. _____ Total # of **teachers** supported, trained, or otherwise provided with resources to strengthen classroom teaching or learning.

19. _____ Total # of **pre-K through grade-12 students** served [includes _____ youth 9-19 who used, participated, visited, or otherwise interacted with activities, experiences, resources, or products offered by your grant].

20. _____ Total # of **viewers and listeners** for radio, television, and cable broadcasts (for series, include total actual audience for all broadcasts; do not include audience for PSAs or other promotional activities or Webcasts; do not report potential audience).

21. _____ Total # of **users of Web-based resources** provided by your grant (include all individuals the project served). Choose the measure that best represents your use rate (choose only one): _____ visits (hits), _____ unique visitors, _____ registered users, _____ other measure (specify): _____.

22. 289 Total # of **individuals** benefiting from your grant (include all those from questions 18-21 plus others the project served, including staff or others in your field). Only include those who actually participated or used your project services in some way.

23. This number includes: 40 **professionals**, 17 **non-professionals or pre-professionals**, _____ **docents or interpreters**, 9 **volunteers**,
15 **staff** that received services provided by your grant.

24. If your grant served one or more quantifiable audiences not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

Directions for submitting this report are available at <http://www.imls.gov/recipients/administration.shtm>. For assistance or questions contact your Program Officer.

Burden Estimate and Request for Public Comments: Public reporting burden for this collection of information (Final Report, Parts 1 and 2) is estimated to average eight to thirteen hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Chief Information Officer, 1800 M Street, NW, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20036-5802, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 3137-0029, Washington, DC 20503.

**Missouri State Museum, Connecting to Collection Statewide Planning Grant
Final Performance Report, Pt. 2: Quantitative Information**

Attachment for Following Questions:

Site Specific Project Activity: Planning, Survey and Workshops

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here.

In addition to the workshops, the grant activities also included the formation of an advisory group, a survey of heritage collecting institutions, and the creation of an online directory of these institutions.

199 institutions responded to the survey (495 institutions received the survey)

10 professionals participated in multiple meetings of the advisory group

450 institutions were entered into the online directory/database